

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 93 13:06:37 PST  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #21  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Tue, 5 Jan 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    21

Today's Topics:

                    1200Mhz is not a microwave band!  
                    [ANS] Re: [FWD] End fed 1/4 wave 80 meter antenna  
                                Closed Repeaters.  
                                Hot Rigs  
                    Looking for HyperCard License Test Stacks  
                                New Portable Receiver  
QSL cards from SWLers (was Re: Ham transmissions-a hypothetical situation)  
                    Recomendations for 2m/70cm all-mode wanted  
                                TM-732A Remoting  
                    Vertical Antennas - feedback on R7,GAP,BUTTERNUT

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 20:02:58 GMT  
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!NewsWatcher!user@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: 1200Mhz is not a microwave band!  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

> In article <9301051454.AA02438@tix.timeplex.com> taylor@tix.timeplex.COM (Seth  
Taylor) writes:

> >Since so called "microwave ovens" operate in the UHF designation  
> >frequency range why don't we call them a "UHF" ? Think about that  
> >one.  
>

by the way...has anyone ever used tried to modulate old oven parts???



-----  
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 93 19:59:50 GMT  
From: walter!porthos!vixen!mdc@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Closed Repeaters.  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I hope I am not prolonging the "closed repeater" thread but I would like to put a couple of comments in before it (I hope) dies.

We have a repeater here in New Jersey (call, frequency and location omitted by design) that I think typifies the problem. This repeater is owned by a club. The repeater comes on the air, generally, between 6 and 11 PM. The repeater is used **\*\*ONLY\*\*** for DX spotting, so if there is nothing rare on the HF bands then the repeater is quite **\*\*EXCEPT\*\*** for the IDing that lets you know there is a repeater there.

The repeater is operated as a closed repeater and the PL changes monthly or quicker. To be a member of the club you **\*\*MUST\*\*** have a DXCC number. The last I heard there were nine active members in the club.

I feel that if at all possible the repeater coordinator(s) should reassign the pair in cases like this. Maybe the FCC should delegate the power to do this??

I do not disagree with closed repeaters, (I don't like them) but to use the "if your going to play you must pay" analogy then, unless the owner of the repeater is independently wealthy, you should be willing to pay for the maintenance, etc to use the repeater.

--  
David C. Marden  
Bell Communications Research  
100 Schultz Dr. P.O. Box 7050  
Red Bank, NJ 07701-7050  
KE2AG@N2KZH.NJ.USA  
908-758-5643  
mdc@cc.bellcore.com

-----  
Date: 5 Jan 93 17:13:30 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Hot Rigs  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

N7XVS Writes:

>I would think a system you could call and enter the serial number through a

```
>touch-tone phone would not be that complicated.  It could even be tied into
>packet and/or the internet.
```

I say:

This is true, and the system exists. Whenever I'm offered a suspiciously low price on used gear (Ham, Computer, Firearms, or Automobiles) I make it a point to check the National Crime Information Computer to see if it is listed as stolen. I access it via a touch-tone phone call to whatever police agency serves the local where I'm standing at the time, but I believe that a rotary-dial phone would work just as well.

I have had a little reluctance in some locations, but usually speaking with the Desk Sergeant gets the gear checked for me. If they start running when I mention that I need to check if the stuff is stolen (for insurance purposes, you understand:)) then I note the license plate, the description, etc. and make the call. I get a lot of response when that happens.

73

```
----- -!:- -----
Alan V. Cook                      Internet: AVCOOK@ananov.remnet.ab.com
Rockwell International            Ham Packet: N7CEU @ WF60
(714) 762-0843                  DoD: #0701
                                Alternate Internet: Cookav@catipult.anatcp.rockwell.com
```

Date: 5 Jan 93 20:12:51 GMT  
From: news.tek.com!gvgpsa!gold.gvg.tek.com!gvgadg!randyh@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Looking for HyperCard License Test Stacks  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am looking a FTP site that my be holding HyperCard License Stacks.  
Does anyone know of one?

Thanks,  
Randy  
WA2AGE

randyh@gvgadg.gvg.tek.com

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 14:24:25 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!linus!linus.mitre.org!mwvm.mitre.org!  
m14494@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: New Portable Receiver  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Robert Carpenter writes:

> The December 1992 (boat show) edition of the French yeachting magazine  
> "Bateaux" has a picture and writeup on an interesting new Sony radio.  
> It is the ICF 55.

This is the Sony ICF-SW55, and it's been on the US market for quite some time now. I have one, and it's a very nice SWL receiver. It covers 150kHz - 30 Mhz AM and SSB/CW, plus FM broadcast. The BFO is not all that stable; it's ok for casual listening, but probably not good enough for RTTY or other digital modes. The big deal about this radio is "station name tuning"; the 125 memories are arranged into "pages" of 5 memories each. Each page can be named using a 12 character alphanumeric display. Thus, you can have one bank of memories devoted to "BBC", another to "WWV", etc. You can also punch in frequencies directly via keypad, or tune using the dial. The dial works ok, but is not really all that "substantial"; it is set flush with the front of the radio, and you turn it with a fingertip. The whole radio is about the size of a small hardback book, and weighs only a few pounds, including its 4 AA batteries, which only last for 7 hours of intermittent use (!). All in all a very nice portable SWL reciever; I've had mine for a few months, and am quite pleased with it. EEB sells them for \$369 when they can keep them in stock, and some of the mail order places sell them for \$299. Cheers...

Mike, N4PDY.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* These are my opinions only.\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

-----

Date: 5 Jan 1993 19:53:46 GMT  
From: noc.near.net!transfer.stratus.com!sw.stratus.com!fms@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: QSL cards from SWLers (was Re: Ham transmissions-a hypothetical situation)  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan5.161735.17871@ke4zv.uucp>, gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

> In article <1993Jan5.085312.22208@ringer.cs.utsa.edu> sbooth@lonestar.utsa.edu  
>(Simon E. Booth) writes:  
>  
> [...]  
>  
> >Which takes me to another more unusual question:  
> >Have amateur operators ever receiver reception reports from regular  
> >shortwave listeners?

>  
> Sure. It's less common today than when we were operating AM, but it  
> still happens from time to time. Most hams who QSL, not all do, will  
> reply to a SWL card.  
>

What does one reply to a SWL card? I got one recently, and didn't realize that some sort of reply was appreciated. Just a note saying thanks? or is there something more that should be done? I'd hate to leave the guy hanging if he's expecting some sort of reply...

73 de Faith N1JIT

--

Faith M. Senie	InterNet: fms@vos.stratus.com
Stratus Computer, Inc.	InterNet: fms@hoop.sw.stratus.com
55 Fairbanks Blvd.	Pkt Radio: n1jit@ka1srd.ma.usa.na
Marlboro, MA 01752	Phone: (508)460-2632

"I'm afraid I don't know very much about Romulan Disruptor settings" --Spock

-----

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 20:40:23 GMT  
From: beta.lanl.gov!tjf@lanl.gov  
Subject: Recommendations for 2m/70cm all-mode wanted  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am trying to locate information and recommendations for 2m/70cm dual-band allmode transceivers, whether mobile or base. Are there any users out there who'd like to email or post comments on their rigs? Anyone have one for sale? What kind of bank account damage will I have to explain to my wife for a used rig?

-Tom KD5??? (License in the mail)

-----

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 20:46:34 GMT  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnewsk!cbnewsj!ker@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: TM-732A Remoting  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'd like to remote the head of a TM-732A without purchasing Kenwood's remoting kit. I understand the connector used for the head (not the mike) is an uncommon connector. Does anyone know where to get this connector?

--

-----  
Ken Roser - WA2VCI - ker@mtgzfs3.att.com - AT&T Bell Laboratories - 908-957-5822  
-----

-----  
Date: 5 Jan 93 18:07:57 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!stanford.edu!apple!veritas!amdcad!  
weitek!johnm@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Vertical Antennas - feedback on R7,GAP,BUTTERNUT  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The subject says it. I am considering a mulit-band vertical. I would prefer to use a 1/2 wave which does not need ground radials (I have a bad leaf problem on the roof, radials would make this worse). Any feedback on the GAP Eagle-VI ? this seems to have no ground radials apart from 8ft 'counterpoises' somewhat like the R7, and is some \$100 cheaper. Thanks for any responses...

John N6RCD.

-----  
Date: 5 Jan 1993 18:27:23 GMT  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <lialnnINnt37@transfer.stratus.com>, <8323@lib.tmc.edu>,  
<1993Jan5.171347.2389@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>1  
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

[Followups to rec.radio.amateur.policy, where this discussion belongs.]

In article <1993Jan5.171347.2389@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>  
whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:  
>The anology of a priviave vehicle compared to a private repeater is  
>totally flawed.

I agree, but was trying to deal with things as they were posted.

>No one is suggesting that anyone MUST turn over their  
>private property to anyone else.

No, but they ARE arguing that all repeaters should be open if they wish to avoid being interfered with by other repeaters. That's equivalent to telling repeater owners what they can do with their repeaters, and that's as good as taking the repeater away from the owner.

>Sure you make the relays  
>kerchunk and the circuits operate but the "owner" of that repeater  
>is the responsible party to ensure an access arrangement that is  
>private enough to eliminate those that s/he doesn't want to operate  
>the private repeater.

...and it is this that the open repeater partisans are arguing against.

>As others have pointed out, this is really poor engineering if any  
>system (repeater, computer, etc.) is that easily brought down by  
>someone just "playing" with different codes. If a user  
>needs to be that sophisticated then the access process must be  
>that much more secure to eliminate all probability of a casual  
>user inadvertently or deliberately gaining access and "crashing  
>down" the system.

...but that requires that the repeater be closed, and that goes against the arguments that the open repeater partisans are making.

>Experimentation is and should be encouraged, but as with all experimentation  
>there is also the risk of the unknown. Learning that someone punching  
>up some indiscriminate touch-tone brings down the system would be  
>the kind of thing that experimentation is supposed to find out  
>and then modification and improvement is done to eliminate those  
>shortcomings.

...which is what closed repeater owners do.

>No, if the access process is sophisticated and secure enough then no one  
>but those "authorized" by Jim will be able to use the repeater. If Jim  
>has no access control (or only a simple PL) then he can't expect that  
>others aren't likely to just key up and use the repeater. Under  
>those circumstances, Jim's only recourse, turn off the repeater  
>or change the access process.

...and so the person gets on the output and keeps Jim from using the repeater anyway, according to the arguments of the open repeater partisans. After all, he doesn't own the frequency, right? Bah!

>Another point, why is the presumption here that the only possible situation  
>is one in which "someone that doesn't like Jim" is deliberately trying  
>to prevent Jim from using his repeater? I just don't like the concept of  
>private repeaters in general because there's only a finite amount of  
>support, limited to the area I live in, which I can "donate to" to  
>sustain repeater operations. My travels (vacation/business/etc.) with which  
>I usually bring an HT should not mean I need to lay out \$\$\$ to participate  
>in the use of other repeaters elsewhere around the country on Amateur  
>Frequencies I am fully licensed to operate on.



OK, so broaden the hypothetical to include people who don't like closed repeaters. There have been a few jammers on Jim's system who have done it because they didn't like closed repeaters.

Nobody is saying that transient users should be run off. Jim has said repeatedly that he's only concerned about those who wish to use the machine regularly but not support it like the rest of his users are doing.

There are still plenty of open repeaters, especially on 2 meters. If I travel, and take my 440 handheld with me, I expect to have to tune around a while to find a repeater I can use - regardless of open/closed status, I'd have to tune around anyway. What's the difference?

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"Science is all in the public domain, and allows few secrets."

-- Tom Clancy, \_The Sum of all Fears\_

-----

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 19:51:39 GMT

From: news.acns.nwu.edu!casbah.acns.nwu.edu!jweiss@network.UCSD.EDU

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan4.191814.25568@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>, <11373@prijat.cs.uofs.edu>,  
<POPOVICH.93Jan5104642@morningside.cs.columbia.edu>

Subject : Re: NASA Project Dante & Compressed Video?

In article <POPOVICH.93Jan5104642@morningside.cs.columbia.edu>  
popovich@cs.columbia.edu (Steve Popovich) writes:

>> Considering how much trouble they have had just keeping it's legs attached,  
>> I can't imagine them keeping a high-speed packet network running.

>>

>> And anyway, when the legs fall off again, they can always drag it back out  
>> with the fiber-optic cable. :-) or is it :-(

>

>Low blow! Besides, that's about what happened in Antarctica :-). The  
>legs stayed on, but their fiber-optic cable didn't unreel properly.  
>It developed a kink, and when they tried to straighten it out, the  
>fiber broke. Mission scrubbed. Sigh.

Nasa can't seem to get cable reel's to work on the ground or in space. Sigh\*\*2.

I think the fiber was carrying real-time video from each of the feet, other places and normal telemetry. I could how it would have been difficult to transmit this much data with antenna aiming and power consumption issues involved.

The video carried on the networks was obviously compressed. I wonder how much other data gets routinely carried between Antarctica and the rest of the world. There's probably more bandwidth available, but carrying full bandwidth TV reports is probably not high on the list.

--

Jerry S. Weiss            "If you can't stand the heat, stay out of the antimatter!"  
j-weiss@nwu.edu        Dept. Medicine, Northwestern Univ. Medical School

-----

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1993 17:09:32 GMT  
From: usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan02.061920.7115@ssc.com>, <1993Jan2.133936.1@ttd.teradyne.com>,  
<1993Jan04.042255.17643@ssc.com>  
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan04.042255.17643@ssc.com> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:  
>In article <1993Jan2.133936.1@ttd.teradyne.com> rice@ttd.teradyne.com writes:  
>>Read what I wrote. You don't HAVE to DO anything. But if you don't want  
>>the station to be repeated, you have the right to not do so.  
>>  
>>But if the frequency is not in use at the time you have no exclusive right  
>>to say who can or cannot transmit on that frequency. And nothing in part  
>>97 implies that you have that right.  
>>  
>  
>Nope, you're wrong. Otherwise, why would we need coordination?

Coordination is a \*voluntary\* cooperative effort among repeater owners to minimize mutual interference. Coordinators have \*no\* legal standing to assign frequencies, in fact exclusive frequency assignments are specifically prohibited by 97.101(b) "No frequency will be assigned for the exclusive use of any station." Coordinators can only \*recommend\* frequencies to be used by stations in repeater operation.

The only legal standing coordination has is in arbitrating disputes between repeater transmitter owners when one repeater transmitter causes harmful interference to another repeater transmitter. The FCC doesn't license receivers. The FCC says in 97.205(c) "Where the transmissions of a repeater cause harmful interference to another repeater, the two station licensees are equally and fully responsible

for resolving the interference unless the operation of one station is recommended by a frequency coordinator and the operation of the other station is not. In that case, the licensee of the noncoordinated repeater has primary responsibility to resolve the interference."

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				emory!ke4zv!gary@gatech.edu

-----

Date: 5 Jan 93 20:40:48 GMT  
From: olivea!sgigate!odin!jerber.sandiego.sgi.com!jerryb@ames.arpa  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan5.085312.22208@ringer.cs.utsa.edu>,  
<1993Jan5.161735.17871@ke4zv.uucp>, <1icp0aINNmiv@transfer.stratus.com>n  
Subject : Re: QSL cards from SWLers (was Re: Ham transmissions-a hypothetical situation)

In article <1icp0aINNmiv@transfer.stratus.com>, fms@sw.stratus.com (Faith Senie) writes:

|> In article <1993Jan5.161735.17871@ke4zv.uucp>, gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:  
|> > In article <1993Jan5.085312.22208@ringer.cs.utsa.edu>  
|> sbooth@lonestar.utsa.edu  
|> >(Simon E. Booth) writes:  
|> >  
|> > [...]  
|> >  
|> > >Which takes me to another more unusual question:  
|> > >Have amateur operators ever receiver reception reports from regular  
|> > >shortwave listeners?  
|> >  
|> > Sure. It's less common today than when we were operating AM, but it  
|> > still happens from time to time. Most hams who QSL, not all do, will  
|> > reply to a SWL card.  
|> >  
|> >  
|> What does one reply to a SWL card? I got one recently, and didn't  
|> realize  
|> that some sort of reply was appreciated. Just a note saying thanks? or  
|> is  
|> there something more that should be done? I'd hate to leave the guy  
|> hanging

|> if he's expecting some sort of reply...  
|>  
|> 73 de Faith N1JIT

What 'the guy' is expecting and hoping for is simple... your QSL card!

73,  
Jerry KC6TAY

~~~~~  
Jerry Bransford  
Silicon Graphics  
(619) 546-0409  
~~~~~

-----  
Date: 5 Jan 1993 20:30:20 GMT  
From: noc.near.net!transfer.stratus.com!bigbootay.sw.stratus.com!  
leadfoot@uunet.uu.net  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <8319@lib.tmc.edu>, <1ialnnINNt37@transfer.stratus.com>,  
<8323@lib.tmc.edu>  
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters

In article <8323@lib.tmc.edu>, jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

|> In article <1ialnnINNt37@transfer.stratus.com>

leadfoot@bigbootay.sw.stratus.com (Mark Curtis) writes:

|> >In article <8319@lib.tmc.edu>, jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard)  
writes:

|> >|> OK...but let's add some more things to make your analogy even closer: First  
of

|> >|> all, the highway has hundreds of lanes.

|> >And there are thousands of users/drivers. If you live in any metro area

|> >you know that demand for more lanes rises faster than they can be built.

|>

|> ...but, since there are hundreds of lanes, changing lanes to one that doesn't

|> have someone's Porsche in it is not only possible but easy.

Except he isn't the only person parking in the lanes. Hundreds of others  
have the same idea. Nobody has a problem with them using the road to drive  
on, it's using it for a private parking lot when they aren't that we have  
a problem with.

|> Sorry, but this doesn't wash either. You're demanding that Jim change his  
|> Porsche into a public bus, just liek all the public busses in all the other  
|> lanes. Are you going to pay for it? If not, then what gives you the right to

|> take his property?

You can't be that thick skulled, you must be playing dense to avoid my point. No one is saying he should be forced to play taxi driver. Just don't park the damn thing in the middle of the road when you aren't using it. Let someone else use the lane while you aren't. I realize not having to bother with other people is real handy, but it doesn't work that way.

|> You're demanding that Jim hand the keys to his Porsche to anyone who comes along and asks. Are you prepared to buy the machine from him? If not, then how dare you tell him how to run it?

I don't care how much you spent on your car/repeater it doesn't grant you the right to section off an area of public property for your private use. You can spend all the money you want, but it isn't going to change the fact that you are using public property.

AS STATED BEFORE, the situation is more like this:

Let me put it to you this way. In your neighborhood there is a public park. You like the park, but you feel that you and few friends would enjoy the park more if you added a BBQ grill. So you use your own money to add a BBQ grill to the public park and enjoy it very much.

Now a new family moves in and starts using the park. You don't know, care, or like them so you try to tell them they can't use your grill. The problem is that your grill is built on public land, not private land. If you don't want them to use it while you aren't there the only thing you can do is take it with you when you leave. You can't rope off the area around the grill and claim it as your private area 24-hours a day even when you aren't there. You don't own the land the public does. Either share the grill or remove it from public property when you are done for the day.

I'm not saying you have to let them use your grill/repeater, just don't try to lay claim to public property by building something on it. If you don't want to share your stuff (take it home/shut it off) when you are done (using the park for the day/talking). That way someone else, who has equal an equal right to use the park, can get the full use of the park that you enjoyed. Claiming exclusive rights to part of the park wrongly deprives them of its full use. It isn't your's to claim.

I'm not saying don't put up a repeater. Just don't get this "I own this pair stay the hell off it" attitude. You don't own anything except your repeater hardware and attitude. If someone you don't like starts using the machine turn it off. Getting on with an "I own this freq" attitude is wrong and silly. Just turn your repeater off, that is the only thing you do own and control.

-----  
End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #21  
\*\*\*\*\*